

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on June 17, 2011. The claims have been amended and no new matter has been added to the disclosure. In light of the preceding amendments to the claims and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Currently, claims 1-18 stand rejected. For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicant's remarks concerning the application will be presented in the same order in which the Examiner presented them in the Office Action.

Rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph

Concerning item 4 of the subject action, Claims 1 and 8 were rejected for failing to comply with the written description requirement of 35 USC 112. Specifically, item 4.a on page 3 states that the claimed "non-specialized transceivers" of claim 1, and the "standard non-specialized handheld transceivers" in claim 8 are not supported by the specification. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 and removed the rejected language.

Concerning item 4.b on page 4 of the subject action, claim 8 was rejected for failing to support the limitations "a single frequency" and "automatically converting . . ." in the specification. Applicant's amended claim 8 reads "a common frequency and format", which is fully supported by the specification on page 7, line 2, which reads "converts it to a common format and frequency." Applicant respectfully asserts that the limitation of "automatically converting . . ." is fully supported by the specification in numerous locations, specifically on page 10, line 8, which reads that the "modules will automatically recognize the new responder,

register them into the network, and authorize the network resource for communications and information exchange.”

Concerning item 4.c of the subject action, claim 8 was rejected for reciting the limitation of “mini add-on modules each adapted to be carried by a different transceiver.” Claim 8 has been amended to be clearer. Amended claim 8 recites “a number of handheld transceivers”, and “mini add-on modules each adapted to be carried by one of the number of handheld transceivers.” This amendment makes clear that the mini add-on modules are each adapted to be carried by one of the transceivers. Figures 6A and 6B of the original disclosure clearly demonstrate the add-on modules adapted to existing transceiver devices, and claim 8 is therefore supported by the specification

Concerning item 4.d of the subject action, claim 1 was likewise rejected for similar language. Amended claim 1 now clearly claims “a number of transceivers” and “add-on modules . . . each coupled to one of said transceivers”. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is likewise supported by the specification.

Concerning item 5 on pages 4-5 of the subject action, claim 8 was rejected for failing to comply with the enablement requirement by claiming “automatically converting verbal communications associated with said transceiver to single frequency.” Currently amended claim 8 recites:

automatically **converting verbal communications** associated with said transceiver **to a common frequency and format** such that the use of said mini add-on modules establishes a common frequency and format regardless of what frequencies and format said handheld transceivers are using

The Examiner objects saying that Applicant does not disclose how the conversion happens “since the output of a verbal communication would be data while the frequency would

be a channel for data transmission.” The Examiner is correct in saying that the verbal communications are data (i.e. information), but the data is not being converted into a “channel for data transmission.” As previously quoted on page 7, lines 1-3 of the original specification,

What makes for the compatibility is the use of modules that take **information** from the transceivers and converts it to a common format and frequency for transmission around the network.

As clearly stated, the verbal communications are **information**, which is converted into “a common format and frequency for transmission.” The data is not converted into a transmission channel, but rather converted to use a common channel, which is clear from the specification. Applicant, therefore respectfully asserts that Claim 8 complies fully with 35 USC 112.

Concerning item 6 of the subject action, claim 8 was rejected as indefinite for using the word “like” in describing the limitation. The word has been removed from amended claim 8 and Applicant submits that claim 8 now overcomes this rejection.

Concerning item 7 of the subject action, claim 8 was again rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph for reciting the language quoted above. As stated, the communications are not converted from data into a transmission channel, but rather the information is converted “to a common format and frequency for transmission around the network.” See specification p. 7, lines 1-3. Item 7 also rejects claim 8 for using the word “different” in reference to the “number of handheld transceivers.” The word was used to distinguish one of the “number of transceivers” from another, but because it was confusing, the language has been amended and is now more clear. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 8 is in compliance with 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Similarly, item 8 of the subject action again rejects claim 1 for the reasons stated above. Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is in compliance with 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

On page 7 of the subject action, claims 1 and 8 were rejected for failing to provide antecedent basis for limitations. Applicant asserts that the current amendments to claims 1 and 8 overcome these rejections.

Page 7 also includes a paragraph not relevant to the present application, in which unknown "Claims 26, and 33-40 are rejected". The present application does not have any such claims.

Because of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-18 are now in compliance with 35 USC 112. Applicant therefore requests that the rejections under 35 USC 112 be withdrawn.

Objections

On page 8 of the subject action the amendment was objected to, and two requirements were made. A complete listing of all the claims was required, and claims 15-20 from the amendment on January 28, 2011 were required to match those from the August 30, 2010 amendment.

Regarding the first requirement, the January 28, 2011 amendment included a complete listing of all the claims 1-20. Claims 19 and 20 were canceled, and therefore the text was not included as is practice according to 37 CFR 1.121.

Regarding the second requirement, according to Applicant's files, the August 30, 2010 amendment (certificate of mailing dated August 24) has identically matching claims 15-20 as the

amendment and response filed January 28, 2011. In the office action dated 11/26/2010, Examiner acknowledges the amendments filed August 30, 2010 on page 2 of the office action. Likewise on page 2 of the subject action, Examiner acknowledges the amendments filed on January 28, 2011. Applicant respectfully asserts that the amendments referenced have all included complete listings of matching claims. The current amendment also includes a complete listing of claims. Therefore, Applicant requests that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

On page 2, item 2 of the subject action, Examiner states that “the rejections of claims 1 and 8 from previous office action have been overcome as a result of amendment and remarks.” The present office action, however, restates the rejections of claims 1-7, 8, and 10-17 as worded in the previous action dated 11/26/2010. Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the arguments from the previous amendment as convincing to overcome the 35 USC 103 rejections of independent claims 1 & 8.

The only new rejections in the present action are the rejections of claims 9 and 18 found on pages 18-20 of the present action. Because claims 9 and 18 are both dependent upon independent claim 8, which has been held nonobvious (see page 2, item 2 of the subject action dated 6/17/2011), therefore claims 9 and 18 are also nonobvious. Applicant, therefore, asserts that claims 1-18 are in compliance with 35 USC 103, and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the specification and claims are now in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney named below to facilitate prosecution of this application. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account 19-0130.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel J. Long/
Daniel J. Long
Reg. No. 29,404

Customer Number 22500
Correspondence Address:
Patent Dept. BAE SYSTEMS
PO Box 868, NHQ1-719
Nashua, NH 03061-0868
Tel. No. (603) 885-2643
Fax. No. (603) 885 2167